1	The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was <i>not</i> written
2	for publication in and is <i>not</i> binding precedent of the Board.
3	
4	UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
5	
6	
7	BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
8	AND INTERFERENCES
9	
10	Ex parte ALEX HOLTZ, ROBERT SNYDER, CHARLES HOEPPNER,
l 1 l 2	GILBERTO FRES, and KEITH G. TINGLE
13	GIEBERTO TREB, und REFITT G. TITTGEE
14	
15	Appeal 2007-0595
16	Application 09/822,855
١7	Technology Center 2100
18	
19	
20	Decided: April 18, 2007
21	
22	Before ANITA PELLMAN GROSS, STUART S. LEVY, and ANTON W.
23 24	FETTING, Administrative Patent Judges.
25	FETTING, Administrative Patent Judge.
26	DECISION ON APPEAL
27 28	
29	STATEMENT OF CASE
30	This appeal from the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-14, the only claims
31	pending in this application, arises under 35 U.S.C. § 134. We have jurisdiction
32	over the appeal pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 6.
32	over the appear pursuant to 33 o.s.c. y o.
33 34	We AFFIRM.
) 4	W 6 / M 1 HAVI.

- The Appellants invented a way to provide full news integration and automation
- to a video production system, which automatically converts a show rundown into a
- 3 set of computer readable broadcast instructions and automates the execution of a
- 4 live or live-to-tape video show (Specification 6). An understanding of the
- 5 invention can be derived from a reading of exemplary claim 1, which is reproduced
- 6 below:

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

- 1. A method for producing a show live in real time for at least one of transmission and recording in a production environment having at least one processing unit in communications with a plurality of production devices, comprising the steps of:
- (a) receiving a show rundown manually assembled by a producer to comprise a plurality of story files; and
- (b) converting said show rundown into broadcast instructions that, when executed in a step-by-step manner responsive to a manual trigger from the producer in an event-driven manner, enable the transmitting of commands to control the plurality of production devices to thereby produce the show live in real time for at least one of transmission and recording, wherein said transmitting includes transmitting commands to at least a camera, and a robotic pan/tilt head.

21

- 22 This appeal arises from the Examiner's Final Rejection, mailed January 11,
- 23 2006. The Appellants filed an Appeal Brief in support of the appeal on February
- 17, 2006, and the Examiner mailed an Examiner's Answer to the Appeal Brief on
- 25 May 22, 2006. A Reply Brief was filed on July 14, 2006.

PRIOR ART 1 The prior art references of record relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the 2 appealed claims are: 3 Washino Sep. 12, 1995 US 5,450,140 4 Trumbull Aug. 18, 1998 US 5,795,228 5 US 6,437,802 B1 Kenny Aug. 20, 2002 6 (Jul. 14, 1999) 7 US 6,441,832 B1 Tao Aug. 27, 2002 8 (Nov. 26, 1997) 10 **REJECTIONS** 11 Claims 1, 2, 11, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated 12 by Trumbull. 13 Claims 3-6, 8, 12, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious 14 over Trumbull and Kenny. 15 Claims 7 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over 16 Trumbull, Kenny, and Tao. 17 Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Trumbull, 18 Kenny, Tao, and Washino. 19 20

ISSUES
The issues pertinent to this appeal are

- Whether the art applied shows converting a show rundown into broadcast instructions that are executed in a step-by-step manner responsive to a manual trigger from the producer in an event-driven manner (Br. 9).
 - Whether the art applied shows transmitting commands to at least a camera, and a robotic pan/tilt head (Br. 9).
 - Whether the art applied shows populating a broadcast instructions time sheet with production icons (Br. 14).

In particular, the Appellants contend that, as regards all claims, Trumbull does not show execution in response to a manual trigger nor control of a camera (Br. 9) and that, as regards claim 10, Washino does not show use of icons on the same screen as a time relation image (Br. 14).

FACTS PERTINENT TO THE ISSUES

The following findings of fact (FF), supported by a preponderance of substantial evidence, are pertinent to the above issues.

- 01. Claim 1 contains the limitation "converting said show rundown into broadcast instructions that, when executed in a step-by-step manner responsive to a manual trigger from the producer in an event-driven manner, enable the transmitting of commands...."
- This limitation in claim 1 does not recite the performance of a manual trigger, but rather what the response must be should a manual trigger be performed.

03. Trumbull shows

The Content Development and Mapping system 94 inserts content signals into a template for each show. The operator 12 uses the Content Development and Mapping system 94 to "program" shows. For example, a weekly show may utilizes a single template, but different content is inserted into that template for each show. New content may be, for example, signals indicative of new video clips taken from the week's news, new questions and answers for a game show or new celebrities to be interviewed on a talk show.

The Content Development and Mapping system 94 comprises software running on a computing platform, typically on the Activity Server 18. The software of the Content Development and Mapping system 94 defines informational items, known as content, to be inserted into a template. The software accepts subsequent signal entries which are indicative of new content. Signals indicative of each informational item are stored and accessible in a conventional manner through database retrieval tools.

Though the Editing system 82 is used for creating a show, it also exerts control over components of the entertainment system 22 which are active during a show performance. For example, during the final stages of show creation, the Editing system 82 controls the Giant Display Assembly 40, Audio Assembly 42, and Lighting Assembly 44 to aid the operators in evaluating the show and assuring that the show will perform as intended.

(Trumbull, col. 13, 11. 50-67 and col. 14, 11. 1-8).

- 04. Trumbull's Content Development and Mapping system is therefore software that converts a show rundown (content) into performance (broadcast) instructions.
- 29 05. Software under execution is a process that is performed step by step.

 Further, Trumbull's template is the mechanism by which step-by-step show content is programmed.

- 1 06. Thus Trumbull shows converting said show rundown into broadcast 2 instructions that, when executed in a step-by-step manner in an event-3 driven manner, enable the transmitting of commands.
- 4 07. All software is responsive to a manual trigger in that manual intervention may always be employed.
- 6 08. Further, Trumbull shows
- The user 10 and operator 12 interact with the entertainment system 22 through a User Interface 14 which is described in further detail hereinbelow. The User Interface 14 receives input signals from the user 10 and operator 12 such as signals from a button, touch screen, signal transmitter or other equivalent device.

 (Trumbull, col. 5, 1l. 1-6).
- 13 09. Trumbull's user interface shows manual triggers of show execution by
 14 way of buttons, touch screens and signal transmitters.
- 15 10. Thus, Trumbull shows converting said show rundown into broadcast
 16 instructions that, when executed in a step-by-step manner, responsive to
 17 a manual trigger from the producer in an event-driven manner, enable
 18 the transmitting of commands.
- 19 11. Trumbull shows
- The Show Director System 38 thereby controls the intensity of each light source, as well as how each light source tilts, pans, focuses and mixes colors. The Show Director System 38 synchronizes the operation of the light sources with the operation of the Giant Display Assembly 40 and the Audio Assembly 42, thereby enhancing the user's sensory stimulation.
- 26 (Trumbull, col. 8, ll. 3-10).

- 1 12. Thus, Trumbull shows transmitting commands to a robotic pan/tilt head.
- Trumbull shows that a camera is part of the Giant Display Assembly

 (Trumbull, Fig. 4:58), which is controlled by the Show Director System

 (Trumbull, Fig. 3:38, 40).
 - 14. Trumbull shows

- FIG. 3 illustrates in schematic form functional components of the 6 Show Controller 20. While the Activity Server 18 provides logical 7 control by directing a show, the Show Controller 20 provides physical 8 control by controlling physical devices. A Show Director System 38 9 comprises real-time software running on a computing platform such 10 as a Silicon Graphics Onyx class computer. The Show Director 11 System 38 generates show control signals for controlling a Giant 12 Display Assembly 40, an Audio Assembly 42 and a Lighting 13 Assembly 44. The Show Director System 38 thereby controls 14 physical devices involved in a show, such as doors, lights, and image 15 and sound playback apparatus, and thus "performs" the show. By 16 varying the actions of the Giant Display Assembly 40, Audio 17 Assembly 42 and Lighting Assembly 44, the Show Director System 18 38 can perform a variety of different shows. 19
- FIG. 4 shows the Giant Display Assembly 40 in greater detail. A
 Video Playback and Mixing Station 48 receives signals indicative of
 video images from video sources such as a television signal receiver
 46, a video camera 58 and a video tape player 50. In the preferred
 embodiment, the Video Playback and Mixing Station 48 can receive
 signals from twenty sources.
- 26 (Trumbull, col. 6, 11. 37-58).
- Trumbull therefore shows that the Show Controller controls and varies the action of the physical devices, including the Giant Display Assembly, of which a camera is a component.
 - 16. Thus, Trumbull shows transmitting commands to a camera.

- 1 17. Thus, Trumbull shows transmitting commands to at least a camera, and a robotic pan/tilt head.
- Tao shows a broadcast instructions time sheet populated with production icons (Tao, Figs. 14 and 15). Washino shows similar production icons, but used to control multiple production devices (Washino, col. 2, ll. 10-15). The Examiner relies on Tao to show the time sheet relation to the icons and Washino to show the plural production devices relation to icons (Answer 8).

14

15

16

10 ANALYSIS

Claims 1, 2, 11, and 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by
Trumbull.

- From the above findings of fact, we must conclude that
 - The art applied shows converting a show rundown into broadcast instructions that is executed in a step-by-step manner responsive to a manual trigger from the producer in an event-driven manner (FF10).
- The art applied shows transmitting commands to at least a camera, and a robotic pan/tilt head (FF17).
- To the Appellants' contention (Br. 9) that Trumbull does not show a manual trigger being performed, we note that such a trigger is not positively recited (FF02), and that, further, Trumbull does show the apparatus structure for accepting manual triggers (FF09).
- To the Appellants' contention (Br. 9) that the arrows' direction in Trumbull Fig. 4 shows signals only leaving a camera, we note that Trumbull specifies that its

- Show Director controls the devices involved in the show, including the
- 2 components of the Giant Display Assembly, which includes a camera (FF15).
- Further, it would have been understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art that
- 4 the arrows in Trumbull's Fig. 4 represent content flow, not control signal flow.
- 5 The control signal flow is shown in Fig. 3, in which signals go to the Giant Display
- 6 Assembly, which includes a camera.
- 7 The Appellants introduced a contention that the Examiner admitted that the
- video and playback mixing station (Trumbull, Fig. 4:48) does not control the
- 9 camera (Reply Br. 2-3). The Appellants did not recite the Examiner's explicit
- admission, but we conclude on reading the Answer that this refers to the
- Examiner's explanation (Answer 9: ultimate Paragraph) that the user interface
- provides the control, i.e., the user interface controls the video and playback mixing
- station, which in turn controls the camera. The Examiner is merely ascribing the
- location of ultimate control, i.e., the user interface. This argument is no more than
- taking the Examiner's explanation out of context, which, when placed back in the
- proper context, shows that no such admission was made.
- 17 Thus, the Appellants have not shown reversible error on the part of the
- Examiner in this rejection of claim 1.
- The Appellants contend (Br. 8) that claims 2, 11, and 13 are allowable for the
- same reasons as claim 1, whose rejection we sustained, supra. Accordingly we
- sustain the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 2, 11, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §
- 102(b) as anticipated by Trumbull.

1	Claims 3-6, 8, 12, and 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over
2	Trumbull and Kenny.
3	The Appellants contend (Br. 10-11) that these claims are allowable for the
4	same reasons as claim 1, whose rejection we sustained, supra. Accordingly we
5	sustain the Examiner's rejection of claims 3-6, 8, 12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §
6	103(a) as obvious over Trumbull and Kenny.
7	
8	Claims 7 and 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Trumbull,
9	Kenny, and Tao.
10	The Appellants contend (Br. 12) that these claims are allowable for the same
11	reasons as claim 1, whose rejection we sustained, supra. Accordingly we sustain
12	the Examiner's rejection of claims 7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious
13	over Trumbull, Kenny, and Tao.
14	
15	Claim 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Trumbull, Kenny, Tao,
16	and Washino.
17	From the above findings of fact, we must conclude that
18	• The art applied shows populating a broadcast instructions time sheet with
19	production icons (FF18).
20	As to the Appellants' contention (Br. 14) that Washino does not show the use
21	of icons on a screen showing the icons in time-relation to other commands, as the
22	Examiner pointed out (Answer 10), Tao is applied for showing providing an
23	instructions time sheet, and Washino is relied on to show relating instruction

- related icons to plural production devices, such as cameras. Thus, the Appellants
- 2 have not shown reversible error on the part of the Examiner.
- Accordingly we sustain the Examiner's rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §
- 4 103(a) as obvious over Trumbull, Kenny, Tao, and Washino.

9

6 REMARKS

We wish to bring to the attention of the Appellants and the Examiner certain

8 teachings within Washino which, although not material to the rejections currently

of record, might become pertinent in issues regarding obviousness of potential

amended claims should prosecution continue. In particular, Washino explicitly

recites sending control signals to cameras and their pan/tilt heads in a video

production system (Washino, col. 2, 11. 1-4).

13

11

14 DECISION

- To summarize, our decision is as follows:
- The rejection of claims 1, 2, 11, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Trumbull is sustained.
- The rejection of claims 3-6, 8, 12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Trumbull and Kenny is sustained.
- The rejection of claims 7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Trumbull, Kenny, and Tao is sustained.

1	• The rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over
2	Trumbull, Kenny, Tao, and Washino is sustained.
3	No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this
4	appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv) (2006).
5	<u>AFFIRMED</u>
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	hh
17	JOSEPH S. TRIPOLI
18	THOMSON LICENSING INC., PATENT OPERATIONS
19	TWO INDEPENDENCE WAY
20	SUITE 200
21	PRINCETON, NJ 08540